UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/816,155	03/31/2004	Bogdan Cocosel	GOOGP025	9031

23689 7590 08/21/2006

Jung-hua Kuo
Attorney At Law
PO Box 3275
Los Altos, CA 94024

EXAMINER	
CRIBBS, MALCOLM D	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2115	

DATE MAILED: 08/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/816,155	COCOSEL, BOGDAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Malcolm D. Cribbs	2115	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 March 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-35* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-35 *are presented for examination.*

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Westerinen et al [Publication No. US 2006/0123258] [hereinafter referred to as Westerinen] in further view of Helferich [Publication No. US 2005/0215272].

As per claim 1, Westerinen teaches a method of delaying power supplied to system components for the purpose of addressing multiple peaks or spikes of voltage in the load presented to the power supply [Page 4 [0031]]. Westerinen does not teach a method of delaying the signal based on the quality of the signal. Specifically, Westerinen teaches a method of delaying the supply of power to system components based on stability of a power signal. However, Westerinen fails to detail a method of delaying the signal based on detecting the quality of the signal. A routineer in the art would have been motivated to look for a teaching for other possible reasons for delaying a signal.

Helferich teaches another method of delaying a supplied signal. Helferich teaches a method of delaying a signal based on the signal quality [signal strength] wherein the signal is delayed by the delay module until the signal strength is above a specified threshold [Page 6 [0061]]. In summary, Helferich teaches a method of delaying a signal based on the quality of the signal.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Westerinen and Helferich, which are analogous art, because they both teach a method of delaying a signal to be supplied. Helferich covers the deficiency of Westerinen by teaching the detail of further delaying the signal based on the quality of the signal with an added benefit of setting the amount of time to delay the signal being sent. Examiner would also like to note that if the signal cannot be sent until the signal quality has reached a certain threshold, the quality must be continuously checked until the quality is sufficient; therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to again detect the signal quality before the signal is sent.

As per claim 2, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to perform an iteration of the delay generation each time the signal quality detects insufficient signal quality.

As per claim 3, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to randomly select a delay; Westerinen and Helferich both teach a method of delaying the signal for any range of delay time.

As per claim 4, Westerinen teaches a method of disconnecting the power supply line from the system component by disconnecting the connection of the delay power connectors [0031].

As per claim 5, Helferich teaches a method of detecting whether the signal quality on the line is less than a threshold signal quality [Page 6 lines 0061].

As per claim 6, Helferich teaches a method of a timer configured to await the delay and to cause the signal quality detector to again detect the signal quality upon expiration of the delay [Page 6 [0061]].

As per claim 7, Westerinen teaches the system wherein the system component is a disk drive [Fig 3; disk drive 28].

As per claims 8-15, it is directed to the system to implement the module as set forth in claims 1-7. Therefore, it is rejected for the same basis as set forth hereinabove.

As per claims 16-23, it is directed to the power management apparatus to implement the module as set forth in claims 1-7. Therefore, it is rejected for the same basis as set forth hereinabove.

As per claims 24-31, it is directed to the method of steps for power management to implement the apparatus as set forth in claims 16-23. Therefore, it is rejected for the same basis as set forth hereinabove.

As per claims 32-34, it is directed to the resource management system to implement the module as set forth in claims 1-7. Therefore, it is rejected for the same basis as set forth hereinabove.

As per claim 35, it is directed to the method of steps to implement the resource management system as set forth in claims 32-34. Therefore, it is rejected for the same basis as set forth hereinabove.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Malcolm D. Cribbs whose telephone number is 571-272-5689. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8AM-430PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Lee can be reached on 571-272-3667. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Malcolm D Cribbs
Examiner
Art Unit 2115

August 14, 2006

THOMAS LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100